

(MR. SPEAKER.)

members to the House Committee in accordance with sub-rule (2) of rule 175 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly."

*The motion was adopted.*

### Programme of Election

MR. SPEAKER.—I will announce the programme of election. For the purpose of election to the House Committee, the Secretary will receive nominations up to 10 A.M. on Saturday, the 22nd December 1956. If election is necessary, it will take place on Wednesday, the 26th December 1956 in the Committee Room between the hours of 3 P.M. and 5 P.M. The election will be conducted as laid down in sub-rule (2) of rule 175 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of a single transferable vote.

## SENATE OF KARNATAKA UNIVERSITY.

### Motion for election

SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA—Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly do now proceed to the election of four members to the Senate of Karnataka University in accordance with section 15 of the Karnataka University Act, 1949."

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That this Assembly do now proceed to the election of four members to the Senate of Karnataka University in accordance with section 15 of the Karnataka University Act, 1949."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER.—So far as the programme of election is concerned, it will be circulated to the members.

SECRETARY.—Sri Baliga to move the Motion of Address of Thanks.

### Adjournment Motion

SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Yesterday, I tabled an adjournment motion regarding the soaring prices of foodgrains in the Mysore State. You have given a ruling. I am not questioning that ruling. A similar adjournment motion was moved in the Parliament where it was read and disallowed. Here, the practice was that, when an adjournment motion was tabled by a member after the question hour, the member concerned used to be given an opportunity to explain why that adjournment motion should be admitted and if the Speaker was satisfied that it should be admitted, it was for him to say so. But now the procedure that we have adopted appears to be strange. It would have been better if an opportunity had been given to me to show why this adjournment motion should be admitted and notice of adjournment motion should have been made known to the members of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER.—So far as the procedure that I have adopted is concerned, it is not strange to me. Perhaps, it may be strange to some Hon'ble Members here. It is not strange to the members of the Bombay Legislature. Before I disallowed the adjournment motion, I had a talk with the Secretary and I came to know that this was the practice here also. Of course, I could have consulted the Hon'ble Member Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy and then disallowed it. But then I found that the adjournment motion was so patently out of order that I felt that I need not consult him. I am really sorry I could not consult him, but the position is that in such matters there are other avenues open to the member to ventilate his grievances. The Hon'ble Member can ventilate his grievances just now on the Motion of Thanks. I have also asked the Secretary to convey to Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy to table a short notice question on this subject.

When there are other means of ventilating the grievances, it is no use resorting to an extraordinary procedure as an adjournment motion. That was my view and that was why I disallowed it, but I may assure the Hon'ble Member Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy that in cases of this type which may occur in future, I will always make it a point to consult the member concerned and tell him whether I think it necessary or not. Since the member says that that is the practice here, I do not want to deviate from that practice. I will follow that practice.

**Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY** (Bangalore South).—Sir, I understand that under the States Reorganisation Act the Rules of Procedure that were in vogue in the old Mysore State are to be followed even now. But just now you were pleased to mention that in the Bombay Legislature the method of ruling which you gave today was in vogue and accordingly you gave your ruling. So I would like to know, so far as this Legislature is concerned, the Rules of Procedure of which area will be in vogue now.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—So far as this House is concerned, we are to follow the Rules of Procedure of the old Mysore Legislature. There is no doubt about that, because that is provided in the States Reorganisation Act itself. But, this is a matter which does not refer to rules at all. This is a matter of convention. Of course, I might have been ignorant of the convention here, but, that is a different matter. As I have just now said, in Bombay that was the practice. Unless the Speaker found that it was quite essential to consult the member, he would not consult him at all. However, if it is the wish of Members here that I should consult them on every occasion I have no objection in doing so and I will do it.

### MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE GOVERNOR.

**Sri VAIKUNTA BALIGA** (Pane-Mangalore).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following resolution :

L.A.

“ ದಿಕೆಂಬರ್ 19, 1956 ರಂದು ವಿಧಾನ ಮಂಡಲದ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ದ್ವೇಷಿಸಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರು ದಯಪಾಲಿಸಿದ ಭಾಷಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿರುವ ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯು ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ನಾವು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೃತಜ್ಞತೆಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೋರುತ್ತೇವೆ.”

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Before we start discussing the motion, I would like to point out one thing. There are two methods in which the discussion can go on. One is that the Motion of Thanks can be discussed for some time and then the amendments may come in. Another method is that after the Motion of Thanks is moved, the amendments also are moved. I do not know whether members agree with me or not, but I feel that the procedure of moving the Motion of Thanks and the amendments together is better, because then the members can speak not only on the Motion of Thanks but also on the amendments and that will mean saving of some time. So I desire to know from the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition and the other members, what procedure they would like me to follow.

**Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM** (Jagalur).—Since the Leader of the House is new, he cannot throw any light on this. I am in a better position than he in this respect. The usual practice is that two days are allotted for discussion. Since it will take some time to table the amendments, on the first day we usually used to discuss the motion itself and on the second day both the motion and the amendments used to be discussed. We have not yet tabled our amendments. It is only after the motion comes before the House that we can table our amendments. If the amendments can be moved immediately after the motion is placed before the House, we have no objection to discuss both the motion and the amendments together. By the time the mover of the motion finishes his speech we would be able to give our amendments.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I think, that procedure can be followed. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for helping me in adopting this procedure. I will allow the members to table their